

1                   **Proceedings of the Royal Society B**

2                   **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

3                   **Evolutionary heritage influences Amazon tree  
4                   ecology**

5 Fernanda Coelho de Souza, Kyle G. Dexter, Oliver L. Phillips, Roel J.W. Brienen, Jerome Chave, David R. Galbraith, Gabriela  
6 Lopez-Gonzalez, Abel Monteagudo-Mendoza, R. Toby Pennington, Lourens Poorter, Miguel Alexiades, Esteban Alvarez-  
7 Dávila, Ana Andrade, Luis E.O.C. Aragão, Alejandro Araujo-Murakami, Eric J.M.M. Arets, Gerardo A. Aymard C., Christopher  
8 Baraloto, Jorcely Barroso, Damien Bonal, Rene G.A. Boot, José L.C. Camargo, James A. Comiskey, Fernando Cornejo  
9 Valverde, Plínio B. de Camargo, Anthony Di Fiore, Fernando Elias, Terry L. Erwin, Ted R. Feldpausch, Leandro Ferreira,  
10 Nykolas M.F. Fyllas, Emanuel Gloor, Bruno Herault, Rafael Herrera, Niro Higuchi, Eurídice N. Honorio Coronado, Timothy J.  
11 Killeen, William F. Laurance, Susan Laurance, Jon Lloyd, Thomas E. Lovejoy, Yadvinder Malhi, Leandro Maracahipes,  
12 Beatriz S. Marimon, Ben H. Marimon-Junior, Casimiro Mendoza, Paulo Morandi, David A. Neill, Percy Núñez Vargas, Edmar  
13 A. Oliveira, Eddie L. Oliveira, Walter A. Palacios, Maria C. Peñuela-Mora, John J. Pipoly III, Nigel C.A. Pitman, Adriana Prieto,  
14 Carlos A. Quesada, Hirma Ramirez-Angulo, Agustín Rudas, Kalle Ruokolainen, Rafael P. Salomão, Marcos Silveira, Juliana  
15 Stropp, Hans ter Steege, Raquel Thomas-Caesar, Peter van der Hout, Geertje M.F. van der Heijden, Peter J. van der Meer,  
16 Rodolfo V. Vasquez, Simone A. Vieira, Emilio Vilanova, Vincent A. Vos, Ophelia Wang, Kenneth R. Young, Roderick J. Zagt,  
17 Timothy R. Baker

18

19 Additional Supporting information S3

20 Comparison between different evolutionary models

21 Although continuous traits are typically assumed to evolve under Brownian motion  
22 (BM) [1], this may not be the most appropriate evolutionary model, and other models  
23 may perform better for estimating phylogenetic signal [2]. We compared the fit of the  
24 Brownian motion model of evolution with White-noise and lambda models. Brownian  
25 motion represents a random model of evolutionary change along each lineage, which  
26 assumes a constant rate of trait evolution through time, where covariance between  
27 genus trait values is proportional to the duration of their shared evolutionary history.  
28 Under pure BM, phylogenetic signal is equal to one. A white-noise model assumes  
29 that trait data come from a single normal distribution and there is no correlation  
30 between the ecological similarity and phylogenetic relatedness. A model including  
31 Pagel's lambda represents a modification of a Brownian motion model and assesses  
32 the extent of phylogenetic signal by multiplying internal branches of the tree by the  
33 lambda parameter, which ranges from 0 to 1. When lambda values equal one, this  
34 model corresponds to BM.

35 Different evolutionary models were compared using the Akaike's information criterion  
36 AIC. For all traits, the model including Pagel's lambda provided the best fit.

37 **Table S3.** Comparison of different evolutionary models considered for the evolution  
 38 of: wood density, potential tree size, growth rates and mortality rates. The table shows  
 39 lambda estimates and model fitting results statistic, with Akaike's Information Criterion  
 40 (AIC) statistic for the different models: i) Lambda fits the extent to which phylogeny  
 41 predict trait data; ii) Brownian Motion model of evolution; and iii) White-noise, stasis  
 42 model with no phylogenetic signal, where phylogeny does not represents a good proxy  
 43 for trait data

Trait		lambda $\lambda$	Lambda AIC	Brownian motion AIC	White-noise AIC
Wood density	wd	0.65	-9.07	198.75	173.73
	Max. D	0.49	424.48	582.30	497.29
Potential size	Max. Dwd	0.49	955.17	1112.34	1027.99
	Max. AGB	0.50	1129.23	1306.76	1215.75
Growth rates	Maxgr. D	0.40	488.48	632.05	520.77
	Maxgr. BA	0.42	770.89	888.98	809.07
	Maxgr. AGB	0.52	866.06	969.25	919.77
	Meangr. D	0.34	537.05	688.85	558.39
	Meangr. BA	0.36	754.16	894.83	785.57
	Meangr. AGB	0.44	733.03	858.56	782.41
Mortality	Mortality	0.39	478.60	596.46	491.45

44

## 45 References

- 46 1. Felsenstein J. 1985 Phylogenies and the Comparative Method. *The American*  
 47 *Naturalist* **125**(1), 1-15. (doi:10.2307/2461605).
- 48 2. Münkemüller T., Lavergne S., Bzeznik B., Dray S., Jombart T., Schiffers K.,  
 49 Thuiller W. 2012 How to measure and test phylogenetic signal. *Methods in Ecology*  
 50 *and Evolution* **3**(4), 743-756. (doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2012.00196.x).

51 Additional Supporting information S4

52 **Table S4.** Loadings of the first two axes of Phylogenetic Principal Components  
53 Analysis (PPCA) performed on wood density, potential tree size in diameter, maximum  
54 growth rate and mortality rate. All genera (n=214) which had a complete set of trait  
55 data were used for this analysis.

Trait	PPC1	PPC2
Maximum diameter	0.364	<b>0.909</b>
Maximum growth rates	<b>0.926</b>	0.195
Wood density	<b>-0.786</b>	0.123
Mortality	<b>0.711</b>	-0.584
Proportion of variance explained	52.80%	30.50%

56 \* 83.3% of variance was explained by the first two axes.

57 Additional Supporting information S5

58 **Table S5.** Summary of trait data calculated across a subset of 26 plots (Manaus region), including number of individuals per genera,  
 59 number of genera per trait and number of species. The table also shows the respective phylogenetic signal, for Manaus plots,  
 60 Protieae, *Inga* and restricting the number of lineages to 214 genera that have values for all traits. Phylogenetic signal was measured  
 61 using Blomberg's  $K$ . \*\*\* $p<0.001$ ; \*\* $p<0.05$ ; \* $p<0.1$ .

Trait	Manaus				Phylogenetic Signal (K)		Burseraceae		Inga		Restricted number of lineages	
	Nº ind	Nº Genera	Nº Species	Intrageneric variation		Nº Species	Phylogenetic Signal (K)	Nº Species	Phylogenetic Signal (K)			
				No	Yes							
Wood density	wd	-	292	293	0.25***	0.27***	23	0.55	27	0.21	0.24***	
Potential size	Max. D	33.453	160	364	0.26***	0.40***	37	0.34	40	0.3	0.23**	
	Max. Dwd	33.453	160	364	0.29***	0.44***	37	0.23	40	0.24	0.25***	
	Max. BA	33.453	160	364	0.26***	0.40***	37	0.34	40	0.3	0.23***	
	Max. AGB	33.453	160	364	0.29***	0.45***	37	0.24	40	0.31	0.24***	
	Max. gr. D	27.327	152	315	0.25**	0.41***	31	0.35	29	0.7	0.25**	
Growth rates	Max. gr. BA	27.327	152	315	0.26***	0.37***	31	0.33	29	0.86**	0.2**	
	Max. gr. AGB	27.327	152	315	0.28***	0.39***	31	0.2	29	0.52	0.22**	
	Mean. gr. D	27.327	152	315	0.28***	0.45***	30	0.33	29	0.69	0.26***	
	Mean.gr. BA	27.327	152	315	0.28***	0.41***	30	0.38	29	0.76*	0.19*	
Mortality	Mean.gr.AGB	27.327	152	315	0.30***	0.45***	30	0.16	29	0.4	0.24***	
	Mortality	26.894	67	69	0.32***	0.43***	-	-	-	-	0.24***	

62